



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

21C 11-07-86

10.00 103 6.012

#2/9L
DW
3/5/87

In re application entitled: INVERTER CIRCUITS

Applicant: Ole K. Nilssen

Serial No: 06/787,692

Filed: 10/15/85

Group Art Unit: 212

Examiner: WILLIAM H. BEHA

RECEIVED

MAR 02 1987

GROUP 210

I, OLE K. NILSSEN, HEREWITH
CERTIFY THAT THE DATE OF
DEPOSIT WITH THE U.S. POSTAL
SERVICE OF THIS PAPER OR FEE
IS: 2-5-87

[Signature]

AMENDMENT B

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Applicant provides the following response to Office Action
dated 11/07/86.

INITIAL REMARKS

In the first paragraph on page 2 of his latest office
action, Examiner states that:

"Frank et al was discovered during the search of an
unrelated case, and it demonstrates just how unduely broad
applicant's claims are".

Would Examiner please explain to Applicant what official
definition exists in respect to what constitutes an "unduely
broad" claim.

Exactly what is an unduly broad claim?

In Applicant's view, an unduly broad claim is nothing more
than a claim that is so broad as to be covered by some prior
art reference.

100 02/27/87 787692

1 103 40.00 CK

Contrary to Examiner's allegation to the effect that
Applicant's claims are unduly broad, the actual situation is
that Examiner's search was unduly narrow -- as amply demonstrated
by the belated finding of a more appropriate reference.

As a result of the inadequate breadth of Examiner's initial
search, Applicant's Amendment A and the pending appeal have been
rendered inappropriate, thereby having caused Applicant to waste
a great deal of valuable time and energy.